

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

June 1, 1959

1930—1959

Letter No. 456

The Senator Didn't Want The Evidence

ON May 13 Merwin K. Hart, President of the National Economic Council, by request of Senator Talmadge appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of Senator Talmadge's Senate Joint Resolution 32, a proposed constitutional amendment which would vest sole control of public schools in the States. Senator Kefauver of Tennessee presided. Mr. Hart's statement follows:

THE National Economic Council strongly supports S.J. Res. 32, and urges this Committee to report it to the Senate, and hopes it will be adopted by the necessary two-thirds in both Houses of Congress.

Only a few years ago it would have seemed strange, indeed, if any Member of either House had thought it necessary to introduce such a Resolution as this. For, during roughly a century and a half of our national history, all Americans believed that under the wording and spirit of the Constitution, the control of education was exclusively a matter for the States and localities. It was assumed that Article X of the Bill of Rights, which reads as follows, meant just what it said:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Certainly any power over education was never delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States. Education is in its very essence a State and local affair.

BUT while the American people apparently were taking for granted that their liberties would always be with them, cunning socialist and communist mischievous from other lands had infiltrated this country and, by the aid of certain of our intellectuals and many of our educational institutions, had undertaken to put their ideas into effect.

Unquestionably, these alien-minded individuals, with their American converts, were responsible for the integration decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954. That decision did not even pretend to be on legal and Constitutional grounds. One of the authorities most relied on was the Swedish socialist, Gunnar Myrdal, who, after a brief stay in this country, attacked the Constitution of the United States as "nearly a conspiracy against

the common people." There is little doubt that the integration decision was an important part of the campaign of the Soviet leaders to conquer the world, especially the United States.

One Israel Cohen, a leading communist in England in 1912, wrote a book entitled "A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century." In that book he set forth the communist policy. The following extract from this book was included on page 7633 of the Record as printed *daily* (page 8559 of Vol. 103, Part 7 of the *bound volumes*) of the Congressional Record for June 7, 1957:

"We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tension. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by the whites, we can mould them to the program of the Communist Party. "In America, we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavour to instil in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment.

"With this prestige the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause."

Since the integration Supreme Court decision of 1954, the Supreme Court, having assumed legislative power—if not the power to amend the Constitution itself—has extended its anti-segregation policy to many other fields, including playgrounds, swimming pools, transportation, and so forth. But we, of course, are concerned here only with education.

Thus it would appear that communism is the author of the scheme underlying the integration decision whereby the Federal government is taking away the control of our schools from the States and localities. An English communist appears to have contributed the idea and a Swedish socialist was, as it were, an important consultant.

Alien infiltration is the cause of the evil which the Talmadge Resolution seeks to cure.

THERE are several reasons why the Talmadge Resolution should be adopted.

1. Because, with respect to the schools, it would com-

pletely undo the communist grab for power by way of the Supreme Court through the assumption of control over our schools. For so long as our schools remain independent and under State and local control, the ambitions of the communists for conquest of the United States will have a considerable setback.

2. Conditions vary in different parts of the country. From the American standpoint, though not from the communist nor socialist standpoint, what is taught in one section of the country would not necessarily be taught in the same way in another part of the country. Education is tied up in the minds of American citizens with the very heart of their liberties. If they lose control of their education, they will lose control of their children. And part of the very lifeblood of successful Americans has been that, by and large, the children have had the benefit of parental care and discipline and the parents have had the general control over the schools in which their children are taught.

3. Concentration in the Federal government of control over any public activity always costs more than when it is handled locally. As the powers and duties of government increase arithmetically, the cost of them, and the number of personnel required tend to increase almost geometrically.

4. If this new rule established by the Supreme Court in 1954, by which the Court has undertaken to assume control of the schools, is to continue in effect, it will be just one more concentration of power in the Federal government—one more Federal control. Furthermore it will be just so much support for the current movement toward world government through "world law." The State Department has said that there is now no difference between local and national issues.

The backers of "world law" and world government, believe we should assign to the World Court and the United Nations the right to decide which questions are domestic and which international.

The Senate, in all probability, would never have ratified the Charter of the United Nations had it not been for Section 7 of Article II of the Charter, which says that:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State...."

Yet it is Section 7 of Article II that the world government people and the "world law" people wish to reverse.

If we Americans are to keep our liberties, we must preserve the distinction between local and national issues, and between national and international issues. For if we don't we will be helping along the movement to establish a "world law," under which all our liberties are certain to disappear.

Hence, S.J. Res. 32 is of vital importance, not only because of the single subject with which it deals, namely education; but because, if passed, it will be notice to the Administration and the Supreme Court, as well as to other governments, that the people of the United States intend to remain free.

Naturally, every communist- and socialist-infiltrated organization in the United States—and that includes most of the means of communication: press, radio and TV—will oppose this Resolution.

But in our opinion, this Committee has not had a more important measure before it in a long time. [End]

The New York Times of May 14, contained the following account of the Hearing:

U. S. PRESS CALLED RED-INFILTRATED

Merwin Hart Makes Charge
at a Senate Hearing—
Kefauver Disagrees

WASHINGTON, May 13 (AP)— Senator Estes Kefauver, chairman of a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, challenged today a witness' assertion that the country's press, radio and television were Communist-infiltrated.

Mr. Kefauver, Democrat of Tennessee, said he found the assertion "repulsive."

Another witness, Mr. Merwin K. Hart of New York, president of the National Economic Council. He testified in support of a proposed constitutional amendment that would specify that the states have exclusive control of their schools.

Mr. Hart said the proposal would guarantee that the people of the United States intended to remain free. He went on:

"Naturally, every Communist and Socialist-infiltrated organization in the United States—and that includes most of the means of communication: press, radio and TV—will oppose this resolution."

Kefauver Dissents

Senator Kefauver asked Mr. Hart if he had really intended to suggest that the press, radio and television were Communist-infiltrated. Mr. Hart said yes.

"I want to register my dissent," Senator Kefauver said.

Mr. Hart then declared that of the 1,200 daily newspapers in the nation only about thirty were "independent" and the rest were Communist-infiltrated.

At another point, Mr. Hart said that the newspapers had sought to say that the Supreme Court decision, banning school segregation was the law of the land when it was merely the law of the case. He mentioned *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*.

Mr. Kefauver asked Mr. Hart if he were suggesting that *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* were Communist-infiltrated.

"Yes," Mr. Hart replied. "I think they are Communist-infiltrated."

"I'm sorry to hear you make the statement," Mr. Kefauver said. "It is repulsive to me. These papers are trying to do a good job in the public interest. I want no more testimony of that nature."

Both papers said they had no comment "to make" on Mr. Hart's testimony.

N. Y. Times, May 14, 1959

A S a matter of fact, when Senator Kefauver said he found Mr. Hart's assertion about the communist infiltration into this country's means of communication "incredible," and "repulsive." Mr. Hart asked permission to be allowed three days in which to file a bill of particulars to support his statement. Senator Kefauver refused. He didn't want the record cluttered up with the facts.

We give below some of the evidence that might have been included in such a bill of particulars:

IN early January 1956 a subcommittee of the Senate Internal Security Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Eastland of Mississippi, held three days of Hearings in Washington to investigate infiltration in the New York City press corps. The *Chicago Daily Tribune* of January 5, 1956 in an article by Willard Edwards reported in part:

"A Senate exploration of subversive influences in the New York City press corps today brought admissions of past Communist Party membership from two newspaper men. Four others refused to answer questions about communist connections, pleading possible self-incrimination.

"The six witnesses summoned by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee included three employed by *The New York Times*. The others, employed in past periods by the *Times*, are working for the *New York Post* and the *National Guardian*, a leftist weekly."

A N editorial in the *New York Daily News* of January 10, 1956, said in part:

"*The New York Times* turned out to have had 14 present or past employees who had had communist leanings. Most of these clammed up on Fifth Amendment or other grounds.

"*The News* was found to have one employee who refused to answer questions regarding communist connections, and was promptly fired.

"Midway in the Hearings, the *Times* published an editorial saying it felt Eastland was persecuting the paper for having attacked him on various occasions; that his probe menaced the freedom of the press; and that no Congressional committee could dictate *Times*' editorial or hiring policies."

O NE of the men who testified at these January Hearings was James Glaser. An editorial in the *New York Journal American* of January 6, 1956, said in part:

"On Wednesday last, one James Glaser testified before the Eastland Committee.

"Glaser had resigned from *The New York Times* in 1934, to become Managing Editor until 1936 of the *Daily Worker*, the official organ of both the Communist party (USA) and the Communist International.

"Glaser testified that he wrote a pamphlet entitled, 'Hearst—Labor's No. One Enemy,' as part of his job. He did so, he testified, on orders from Gerhart Eisler, who was Moscow's top agent at Red headquarters in New York. Eisler, who is now an official in Communist East Germany, was really the head of the communist conspiratorial activities in this country."

J OHN O'DONNELL, the internationally known columnist of the *New York Daily News*, in his column of January 9, 1956, wrote in part as follows:

"The first lesson to be drawn from these opening three days of public hearings before Senator James O. Eastland's Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is the sharp distinction between the reaction of the *New York Daily News* and the *New York Mirror*, which promptly fired editorial employees who refused to answer questions regarding their personal communist activities on New York newspapers and the identity of their Commie 'cell' co-conspirators, and the jittery pomposity of the pious *New York Times* which editorially started to repair hastily the embarrassing split in the seat of their striped journalistic trousers, even before all *The New York Times'* evidence had been put into the record."

T HE well known independent writer, Joseph P. Kamp, published in 1954 a pamphlet entitled "How *The New York Times* Betrayed its Readers on 'McCarthyism'." Mr. Kamp, who has been fighting communism since 1920, and who is one of the greatest authorities in the country on the subject, was jailed for four months some years ago because he refused to disclose the names of certain of his supporters. We have yet to find anything Mr. Kamp has written that is inaccurate. We give below certain quotations from the pamphlet:

"The public press has a public trust. Having been granted access to the public eye and mind it is obligated to truthful and balanced news reporting and editorial commentary. It is in this public trust which *The New York Times* has betrayed.

"At its masthead *The New York Times* flies the legend: 'All the News That's Fit to Print.' With respect to Senator Joe McCarthy, however, it only prints whatever fits. That is, whatever fits the vendetta which *The Times* has waged against the Wisconsin legislator since his debut on the national scene as an anti-communist.

"*The Times* has pursued Joe McCarthy with a hysteria of invective far out-doing the statesman whom it falsely brands as master of the smear. This is a familiar communist technique, whether *The Times* knows it or not. At the Nuremberg trial, Soviet judges and prosecutors had no scruples in demanding the death penalty for persons accused of the very crimes which the Reds themselves, at the same moment, were perpetrating nearby in captured German prison camps."

Mr. Kamp describes Mr. Arthur H. Sulzberger as:

"A befuddled 'Liberal' . . . 'occupied' as thoroughly as if he had been Hungary or Rumania—by his own journal's Red fifth column . . . a communist cell that supplied the *Red Daily Worker* with a managing editor and which was so large that it had its own official newspaper, which it had the effrontery to call *The New York Times*."

Mr. Kamp further said:

"In blasting the anti-communism film 'My Son John,' Bosley Crowther, drama section editor [of *The New York Times*] referred scornfully to 'the Legionnaire's stubborn bigotry,' likened him to a Nazi and, with a sneer, called him a 'ranting, song-singing patriot.'"

Mr. Kamp also said:

"In another piece entitled 'Facing a Real Dilemma,' April 13, 1952, he [Bosley Crowther] slaps at the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans and the Committee on Un-American Activities for being critical of communists and communist influence in Hollywood, because, he writes, 'the likelihood of even a few subversives—real subversives—in the studios is remote.'

"Yet, within a few months, the Committee on Un-American Activities began hearing a hundred witnesses who had been part of the communist apparatus in the film colony."

A N editorial in the *New York Daily News* of January 10, 1956, referring to the three-day Hearings by the Eastland Committee in Washington, said in part:

"It is common knowledge that the Kremlin strives without cease to worm its agents into all communications systems of the non-communist nations. The object is to turn these countries' newspapers, magazines, movies, and radio and television setups into hypodermic needles for injection of communist poison into people's minds.

"A Congressional investigation of this criminal conspiracy as we see it, is aimed at preserving all Americans' freedoms."

YET Senator Kefauver found Mr. Hart's assertion that most of the press was communist-infiltrated "repulsive." It is easy to see why he refused to let Mr. Hart file a bill of particulars.

The Council has been flooded with telephone calls and letters from both members and non-members, some from Senator Kefauver's home State of Tennessee, commanding Mr. Hart's stand before the Kefauver Committee.

Correction

The Council Letter for May 15 was erroneously numbered 454, the same as the Letter of May 1, instead of 455.

Persons ordering additional copies of either Letter should take care to give the date.

A distinguished lawyer in the Middle West, who is also a member of the National Economic Council, has just returned from an extended trip to Australia. He makes these comments to us:

"You hear of Australia as being a socialistic country. Actually, in many respects they have not nearly gone to the extent that we have, especially tax-wise. The taxes are much more reasonable; the standards of living are high; the wage rates are approximately one-third of those in this country; the country is underpopulated—they have only ten million people in a continent the size of the United States, and half of those live in four cities. It does have tremendous potentialities—Americans are very popular—MacArthur is regarded as a national hero, and one Australian told me that Churchill would not dare to come to Australia. As a matter of fact, I felt much more at home in Australia than I have in any English speaking country I have been in, and that includes Canada. I was tremendously impressed with the country. I saw considerable of it, and that not from a hotel window. I was out in the rural districts, and in Brisbane, Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide. Actually, their political situation is just about the same as ours. As in this country between the Democrats and the Republicans, so in

Miss A. Margaret Schmid

On June 10, 1959, Miss Schmid will have been 50 years in the employ of Merwin K. Hart, and since 1930, of the National Economic Council. For some years a Vice President of the Council, she is in charge of the Utica office.

Miss Schmid participated in the organization of the Economic Council in 1930. She has been a faithful and dedicated staff member and official.

She has been active in civic groups, notably the Zonta Club of Utica, N. Y., of which she is a Past President.

We salute Miss Schmid on this 50th anniversary of her active life and wish her many more useful years.

Australia there is little difference between the Liberals and the Labor Party. They are, however, very industrially minded, and there is tremendous competition to build Australia and populate it.

"I was asked to give several talks while in Australia, and I stressed the fact that that country was in a pioneer stage and *would* develop in the event they had sense enough to permit free enterprise; permit young people to retain the fruits of their efforts, and cut out all this nonsense about social security, short workweeks, etc.

"Of course, as you know, Australia is another illustration of where this country has been priced out of the market. It is impossible for American goods to compete with goods from the U.K. and other European countries, or those produced in Australia (which are comparatively few). We are rapidly getting in the same shape as France, and I notice now that labor's idea of protecting American industry and employees is a tariff barrier, similar to the procedure used in France which, of course, was a terrific economic failure. We are going the same road and, frankly, while I think you are doing a wonderful piece of work I do not think that there is any possibility of stemming this tide. The American people will have to learn the hard way."

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y., and quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter 456, June 1, 1959.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., established in 1930, is a non-profit, non-partisan membership corporation organized under New York State law. It publishes the semi-monthly ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER and occasional ECONOMIC COUNCIL PAPERS.

OFFICERS: President, Merwin K. Hart. Executive Vice President, Constance G. Dall. Vice Presidents: Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, U.S.M.C., retired; Vice Adm. C. S. Freeman, U.S.N., retired; Earl Harding, George S. Montgomery, Jr., Dr. Elwood Rowsey, A. Margaret Schmid, Ora A. Taylor; Secretary, McKay Twombly; Assistant Secretary, Sibylla Schilling; Treasurer, Baird Parks; Director of Research, Norman Dodd.

Subscription \$10 a year, \$6 for six months, \$3.50 for three months. Special rate for student or teacher \$5 a year.
Air Mail Subscription (domestic) \$12.00 a year, Air Mail (foreign) \$15.00 a year.

EXTRA COPIES of this Council Letter 15c each (8 for \$1), \$9 per 100, \$50 per 1,000.

Special prices will be quoted for larger quantities. Please add 3% sales tax for deliveries in Greater New York and 4% shipping charges on quantities of 100 or more.

National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.

903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.